



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,605	01/22/2001	Samuel M. Lester	10002197-1	2526

7590 04/29/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

DENNISON, JERRY B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/767,605	LESTER, SAMUEL M.
	Examiner J. Bret Dennison	Art Unit 2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to Application Number 09/767605 received on 22 January 2001.
2. Claims 1-15 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Spoffard (U.S. Patent Number 6,112,235) hereinafter referred to by Spoffard.

3. Regarding claims 1 and 11, Spoffard discloses a system comprising:
office equipment that includes a display, a display being used by the office equipment to provide status as to operation of the office equipment (Figures 1, 12 and Figure 3, 32);
a computing system, in communication with the office equipment, the computing system for obtaining information unrelated to operation of the office equipment, and for causing the office equipment to display the information in place of a status message

Art Unit: 2143

(Spoffard, col. 2, lines 40-50, Spoffard teaches an HTML website that displays status information of network hardware devices).

4. Regarding claim 6, Spoffard discloses a method comprising:
 - obtaining, by a computing system, information unrelated to operation of office equipment (Spoffard, col. 2, lines 10-15, Spoffard teaches each computer being a personal computer running in a windows based environment, therefore being able to obtain information unrelated to the operation of office equipment);
 - generating, by the computing system, instructions to the office equipment to display the information (Figure 3, 24);
 - sending the instructions from the computing system to the office equipment (Figure 3, 26); and,
 - displaying the information by the office equipment that on a display used by the office equipment to provide status as to operation of the office equipment, the information being displayed in place of a status message (Figure 3, 28-32).
5. Regarding claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, Spoffard teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1, 6, and 11, including wherein the computing system obtains information from an internet site on a network (col. 1, lines 51-52, col. 2, lines 40-50).
6. Regarding claims 5, 10, and 15, Spoffard teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1, 6, and 11, including wherein the computing system

obtains information from another computing system, which requests display of the information (Figure 3, col. 2, lines 40-50, line 66 through col. 3, line 35, Spoffard teaches a client obtaining information from a server, which requests display information from the network device).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 7, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spoffard in view of Prithviraj et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,987,513) hereinafter referred to by Prithviraj.

7. Regarding claims 2, 7, and 12, Spoffard teaches the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1, 6, and 11. Spoffard does not disclose wherein the network devices comprise of at least one of the following: a printer, a scanner, a fax machine, a telephone, and a telephone answering machine.

In an analogous art, Prithviraj discloses a network based management system wherein a user can manage network elements including a printer (col. 10, lines 1-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Spoffard with Prithviraj to allow a user to monitor a

remote network, preferably from several machines and facilitate easier problem resolution for network elements.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (703)305-8756. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (703)308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J. Bret Dennison
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2143



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100